



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,073	06/25/2003	Lynn L. Northrup JR.	LNRT-27.975US	1072
31782	7590	12/14/2005		
CHAUZA & HANDLEY, L.L.P.				
PO BOX 140036				
IRVING, TX 75014				
			EXAMINER	
			MANOHARAN, VIRGINIA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/604,073	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NORTHROP, LYNN L.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Virginia Manoharan	<b>Art Unit</b> 1764	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)                        |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____   |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Newly submitted claims 11-14 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

The originally presented claims 1-10 are directed to system/apparatus, whereas the newly presented claims 11-14 are directed to method/process. The inventions are distinct, each from the other, because they are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus such as e.g.,: systems utilizing compressors, vacuum pumps, heat transfer systems, and heat source devices requiring either electrical, mechanical, chemical or other energy input to operate; evaporative cooling systems; unit utilizing an activated carbon filter; and a unit requiring manual filling and/or removal, as recognized and described by applicant. Note e.g., page 2, first full paragraph of the specification.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 11-14 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

Art Unit: 1764

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear whether the inlet device, for example, do in fact introduce an inlet feed into the enclosure with the recitation of "adapted to". (The numerously recited "adapted to" in the claims should be deleted to obviate this rejection). [Since applicant fails to address this rejection, it is assumed he is acquiescing therein].

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anyone Miller (3,693,370), Stevens et al (4,278,602) or Kurematsu et al.(5,439,560).

The above references are applied for the same reasons as set forth at paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of the previous Office Action.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over anyone of Miller, Stevens et al or Kurematsu et al. as applied to claims 1-8 and 10 above, and further in view of Tajer -Ardebili (5,630,913).

Tajer-Ardebili is applied for the same reason as set forth at page 4, second full paragraph, of the previous Office action.

Applicant's arguments filed August 16, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants following arguments such as : “.. such a mass of liquid in a liquid region for controlling cvaporation in an evaporation region are/is neither taught nor disclosed by the cited prior art of record..” is not persuasive of patentability for the following reasons: However, the argued mass of liquid in a liquid region is not deemed to be a device or apparatus to which the claims are directed. It is more directed to a fluid-in-process and/or to a process limitation which is neither the basis for patentability of an apparatus claim. Nonetheless, Stevens for example, shows in Figs. 1 and 3, a mass of liquid in container (15). Note further col. 3, lines 19-24, wherein the liquid passing through the evaporator coil (18) is heated by the vapor driven from (15) whereby evaporation is effected (presupposing for some controls in the evaporation). The argued “mass of liquid in a liquid region” is deemed not novel nor unobvious.

Thus, in the absence of anything which may be “new” or “unexpected result.” a prima facie case of obviousness has been reasonably established by the art and has not been rebutted. Unexpected results must be established by factual evidence. Mere arguments or conclusory statements in the specification, applicant's amendments, or the Brief do not suffice. In re Linder, 457 F.2d 506, 508, 173 USPQ 356, 358 (CCPA 1872). In re Wood, 582, F.2d 638, 642, 199 USPQ 137, 140 (CCPA 1978).

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1764

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Virginia Manoharan whose telephone number is 571-272-1450.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola, can be reached on 571-272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Angela*  
1764  
12/12/05